arXiv:1602.04533v1 [math.AP] 15 Feb 2016

The Cauchy problem for the shallow water type equations in low regularity spaces on the circle

Wei YAN[a], Yongsheng LI[b], Xiaoping Zhai[c] and Yimin Zhang [d]

[a]School of Mathematics and Information Science, Henan Normal University, Xinxiang, Henan 453007, P. R. China

[b]Department of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510640, P. R. China

[c]School of Mathematics Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University Guangzhou, Guangdong 510275, P. R. China

[d]Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan, Hubei 430071, P. R. China

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate the Cauchy problem for the shallow water type equation

$$u_t + \partial_x^3 u + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2\right] = 0, x \in \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{R}/2\pi\lambda$$

with low regularity data in the periodic settings and $\lambda \geq 1$. We prove that the bilinear estimate in $X_{s,b}$ with $s < \frac{1}{2}$ is invalid. We also prove that the problem is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $\frac{1}{6} < s < \frac{1}{2}$ for small initial data. The result of this paper improves the result of case $j = 1$ of Himonas and Misiolek (Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 23(1998), 123-139.). The new ingredients are some new function spaces and some new Strichartz estimates.

Keywords: Shallow water type equation; Strichartz estimates; Low regularity

Short Title: Cauchy problem for shallow water type equation

Corresponding Author: W. YAN

Email Address:yanwei19821115@sina.cn

Fax number: +86-0373-3326174

AMS Subject Classification: 35G25

The Cauchy problem for the shallow water type equations in low regularity spaces on the circle

Wei YAN[a], Yongsheng LI[b], Xiaoping Zhai[c] and Yimin Zhang [d]

[a]School of Mathematics and Information Science, Henan Normal University, Xinxiang, Henan 453007, P. R. China

[b]Department of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510640, P. R. China

[c]School of Mathematics Computational Science, Sun Yat-sen University Guangzhou, Guangdong 510275, P. R. China

[d]Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan, Hubei 430071, P. R. China

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate the Cauchy problem for the shallow water type equation

$$u_t + \partial_x^3 u + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2\right] = 0, x \in \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{R}/2\pi\lambda$$

with low regularity data in the periodic settings and $\lambda \geq 1$. We prove that the bilinear estimate in $X_{s,b}$ with $s < \frac{1}{2}$ is invalid. We also prove that the problem is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $\frac{1}{6} < s < \frac{1}{2}$ for small initial data. The result of this paper improves the result of case $j = 1$ of Himonas and Misiolek (Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 23(1998), 123-139.). The new ingredients are some new function spaces and some new Strichartz estimates.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider the Cauchy problem for the shallow water type equation

$$u_t + \partial_x^3 u + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2\right] = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{R}/2\pi\lambda, \lambda \geq 1. \tag{1.2}$$

Obviously, (1.1) is the higher order modification of the Camassa-Holm equation

$$u_t + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2\right] = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

with nonlocal form. Equation (1.3) was derived by Camassa and Holm as a nonlinear model for water wave motion in shallow channels with the aid of an asymptotic expansion directly in the Hamiltonian for Euler equations [11, 40]. Camassa-Holm equation has been studied extensively in the last three decades, for instance, see [7, 8, 11, 14, 16–40, 46, 47, 50–53, 61–67, 78, 83, 84, 86]. Fokas and Fuchssteiner [40] proved that the Camassa-Holm equation possesses bi-Hamiltonian structure. Camassa and Holm [11], proved that the Camassa-Holm equation is completely integrable. Camassa et.al. [12] proved that the Camassa-Holm equation possesses peaked solitary waves which are orbitally stable and interact like solitons [1, 32]. Constantin and his co-authors [18, 24] proved that the peaked solitary waves replicate a characteristic for the waves of great height-waves of largest amplitude which are exact solutions of the governing equations for water waves, see also [81]. The result of [78] implies that the Cauchy problem for the Camassa-Holm equation is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{R})$ with $s > \frac{3}{2}$. Under some assumptions on the initial data, Constantin and Escher [15, 22] proved that the Cauchy problem for the Camassa-Holm equation possesses not only the global strong solutions and but also finite time blow-up solutions. Constantin and Molinet [30] proved that the Cauchy problem for the Camassa-Holm equation possesses the global weak solution in $H^1(\mathbf{R})$, see also [83, 84]. Escher and Yin [38, 39] studied the initial-boundary value problem for the Camassa-Holm equation. Lenells [63] studied the correspondence between the KdV and Camassa-Holm equation and the stability of periodic peakons [64]. In contrast to the Camassa-Holm equation (1.3), equation (1.1) loses integrability in the sense that the equation (1.1) is equivalent to a linear flow at constant speed in the right action-angle-variables, see the discussion in [30], but, as shown in Theorem 1.2 of [68], global existence prevails while for Camassa-Holm equation the development of blow-up in finite time is quite frequent.

Omitting the last term, (1.1) yields the Korteweg-de Vries equation

$$u_t + \partial_x^3 u + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

which possesses the bi-Hamiltonian structure and completely integrable and infinite conservation laws. In the recent period, mathematical studies have focus on the Cauchy problem for the KdV equation, for instance, see [4, 5, 13, 57–59, 80]. Especially, the Fourier restriction norm method which is introduced by Bourgain [3, 4] is an effective

tool in solving the Cauchy problem for dispersive equations in low regularity. Using the Fourier restriction norm method, Kenig et. al. [57] proved that the Cauchy problem for the periodic KdV equation is locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $s \geq -\frac{1}{2}$. Bourgain [5] proved that the Cauchy problem for the periodic KdV equation is ill-posed in $H^s([0, 2\pi))$ with $s < -\frac{1}{2}$ in the sense that the solution map is not C^3. By using the I-method which is the modification of high-low frequency technique introduced by Bourgain in [6]. Colliander et.al. [13] proved that the Cauchy problem for the periodic KdV equation is globally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $s \geq -\frac{1}{2}$. By using the inverse scattering method, Kappeler and Topalov [54] proved that the Cauchy problem for the KdV equation is globally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $s \geq -1$. Recently, by using short time Bourgain spaces, Molinet [74] proved that the Cauchy problem for the KdV equation is ill-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $s < -1$. From [57, 58], we know that $s = -\frac{3}{4}$ is the critical indices for the well-posedness of the KdV equation on the real line. By using the I-method and modified Bourgain spaces, Guo [42] and Kishimoto [59] established the global well-posedness result of the Cauchy problem for the KdV equation in $H^{-3/4}(\mathbf{R})$. Very recently, Liu [70] proved that the smooth solutions satisfy a-prior local time $H^s(\mathbf{R})$ bound in terms of the H^s size of the initial data for $s \geq -\frac{4}{5}$ on the real line.

Many people have investigate the Cauchy problem for (1.1), for instance, see [3, 9, 10, 41, 43–45, 68, 69, 71, 73, 77, 82, 85] and the references therein. Compared with the Camassa-Holm equation, the higher-order terms arise because of the desire to go beyond the regime of waves of small amplitude, to capture waves of moderate amplitude, see [27]. Himonas and Misiolek [43] proved that (1.1)-(1.2) are locally well-posed in $H^s([0, 2\pi))$ with $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for small initial data and are globally well-posed in $H^1([0, 2\pi))$ for small initial data. Himonas and Misiolek [45] proved that (1.1)-(1.2) are locally well-posed in $H^s([0, 2\pi))$ with $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for arbitrary initial data and are globally well-posed in $H^1([0, 2\pi))$. A nature question one would ask is that: what will happen when $s < \frac{1}{2}$? As far as we know, there is no result for this case, and it is the reason why we consider this problem .

In this paper, firstly, we prove that the bilinear estimate in $X_{s,b}$ with $s < \frac{1}{2}$ is invalid. Then, by exploiting the spirit of [2, 48, 49, 56, 60, 76, 79] and introducing some new function spaces and Strichartz estimates which are used to establish the bilinear estimates and the fixed point Theorem, we prove that the Cauchy problem for (1.1) is

locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with $\frac{1}{6} < s < \frac{1}{2}$ for small initial data, which improves the result of case $j = 1$ of [43].

From Theorem 1.1 below, we know that the standard Fourier restriction norm method W^s is not effective, thus we must adapt the modified Fourier restriction norm method, in other words, motivated by Theorem 1.1, we make a suitable modification of standard Bourgain space Z^s below.

We present some notations before stating the main results. $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ means that $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{10^9}$. C is a positive constant which may vary from line to line. $A \sim B$ means that $|B| \leq |A| \leq 4|B|$. $A \gg B$ means that $|A| > 4|B|$. $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$. $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$. Let $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ be an even function such that $\Psi \geq 0$, $\operatorname{supp}\Psi \subset [-\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$, $\Psi = 1$ on $[-\frac{5}{4}, \frac{5}{4}]$ and $\Psi_k = \Psi(2^{-k}\xi) - \Psi(2^{-k+1}\xi)$. Throughout this paper, $\dot{Z} := Z - \{0\}$ and $\dot{Z}^+ := Z^+ - \{0\}$. Denote by $(dk)_\lambda$ the normalized counting measure on $\dot{Z}_\lambda = \frac{\dot{Z}}{\lambda}$:

$$\int a(x)(dk)_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda}\sum_{k\in\dot{Z}_\lambda} a(k).$$

Denote by $\mathscr{F}_x f(k) = \int_0^{2\pi\lambda} e^{-ikx} f(x)dx$ the Fourier transformation of a function f defined on $\mathbf{T}$ with respect to the space variable and we have the Fourier inverse transformation formula

$$f(x) = \int e^{ikx}\mathscr{F}_x f(k)(dk)_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda}\sum_{k\in\dot{Z}_\lambda} e^{ikx}\mathscr{F}_x f(k).$$

Denote by $\mathscr{F}_t f(\tau) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-it\tau} f(t)dt$ the Fourier transformation of a function f with the respect to the time variable and we have the Fourier inverse transformation formula

$$f(t) = \int e^{it\tau}\mathscr{F}_t f(\tau)d\tau.$$

We define

$$S(t)\phi(x) = \int e^{ikx}e^{itk^3}\mathscr{F}_x\phi(k)(dk)_\lambda.$$

Denote by

$$\mathscr{F} f(k,\tau) = \int\int_0^{2\pi\lambda} e^{-ikx}e^{-it\tau} f(x,t)dxdt$$

the space-time Fourier transform for $k \in \dot{Z}_\lambda$ and $\tau \in \mathbf{R}$ by and this transformation is inverted by

$$f(x,t) = \int\int e^{ikx}e^{it\tau}\mathscr{F} f(k,\tau)(dk)_\lambda d\tau.$$

Let

$$\Lambda^{-1} = \mathscr{F}^{-1}\langle \tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{F}_x J^s u = \langle k\rangle^s \mathscr{F}_x u(k).$$

It is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{T})} = \|\mathscr{F}_x f\|_{L^2((dk)_\lambda)},\\
&\int_0^{2\pi\lambda} f(x)\overline{g(x)}dx = \int \mathscr{F}_x f(k)\overline{\mathscr{F}_x f(k)}(dk)_\lambda,\\
&\mathscr{F}_x(fg) = \mathscr{F}_x f * \mathscr{F}_x g = \int \mathscr{F}_x f(k-k_1)\mathscr{F}_x g(k_1)(dk_1)_\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$P(k) = -k^3, \sigma = \tau + P(k), \quad \sigma_j = \tau_j + P(k_j).$$

$\eta(t)$ is a smooth function with $\operatorname{supp}\eta(t) \subset [-1,2]$ and $\eta = 1$ on $[-1,1]$. We define the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} = \|\langle k\rangle^s \mathscr{F}_x f(k)\|_{L^2((dk)_\lambda)}$$

and define the $X_{s,b}$ spaces for $2\pi\lambda$-periodic KdV via the norm

$$\|u\|_{X_{s,b}(\mathbf{T}\times\mathbf{R})} = \left\| \langle k\rangle^s \langle \tau + P(k)\rangle^b \mathscr{F} u(k,\tau)\right\|_{L^2((dk)_\lambda(d\tau))}$$

and define the Y^s space defined via the norm

$$\|u\|_{Y^s} = \|\langle k\rangle^s \mathscr{F} u(k,\tau)\|_{L^2((dk)_\lambda L^1(d\tau))}.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= \left\{(\tau,k)\in \mathbf{R}\times \dot{Z}_\lambda : |\sigma| \le 2|k|^2, |k|\ge 1\right\},\\
D_2 &= \left\{(\tau,k)\in \mathbf{R}\times \dot{Z}_\lambda : 2|k|^2 < |\sigma| \le 6|k|^3, |k|\ge 1\right\},\\
D_3 &= \left\{(\tau,k)\in \mathbf{R}\times \dot{Z}_\lambda : |\sigma| > 6|k|^3, |k|\ge 1\right\},\\
D_4 &= \left\{(\tau,k)\in \mathbf{R}\times \dot{Z}_\lambda : |\sigma| > 6|k|^3, \frac{1}{\lambda}\le |k|\le 1\right\},\\
D_5 &= \left\{(\tau,k)\in \mathbf{R}\times \dot{Z}_\lambda : |\sigma| \le 6|k|^3, \frac{1}{\lambda}\le |k|\le 1\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We define Z^s space as follows:

$$\|u\|_{Z^s} = \|P_{D_1\cup D_5}u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} + \|P_{D_2}u\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} + \|P_{D_3\cup D_4}u\|_{X_{1-s,s}} + \|u\|_{Y^s}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{W^s} = \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{Y^s}.$$

We define $Z^s([0,T])$ by the following norm:

$$\|u\|_{Z^s([0,T])} := \inf\{\|v\|_{Z^s} : \qquad u(t) = v(t) \qquad on \qquad t \in I\}.$$

The main result of this paper are as follow.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $s < \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$F(u_1,u_2) = \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u_1u_2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u_1u_2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x u_1)(\partial_x u_2)\right], \tag{1.5}$$

and $u_j (j = 1, 2)$ be 2π-periodic functions. Then

$$\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left[\langle\tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}F(u_1,u_2)\right]\right\|_{W^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{W^s}$$

is invalid.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\frac{1}{6} < s < \frac{1}{2}$, $\int_{\mathbf{T}} u_0 dx = 0$ and u_0 be $2\pi\lambda$-periodic function. Then the Cauchy problems (1.1)(1.2) are locally well-posed in $H^s(\mathbf{T})$ for small initial data.*

Remark 1. From Theorem 1.2, we know that Theorem 1.1 does not imply ill-posedness of (1.1) for $s < \frac{1}{2}$. We will pursue the optimal regularity indices for (1.1).

Remark 2. We make a commentary on the particular choice of parameters in the Z^s function space. Combining Lemma 2.4 with (2.4) of Lemma 2.3, $\Omega_j (1 \le j \le 8)$, we know that choosing function space $X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}$ in regions $D_1 \cup D_5$ is sufficient due to Lemma 2.7. Combining high$\times$ high$\to$ low interaction with $\Omega_j (1 \le j \le 8)$, we know that choosing function space $X_{1-s,s}$ in regions $D_3 \cup D_4$ is sufficient due to Lemma 2.7. By using a direct computation and fixing spaces $X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}$ closely related to $D_1 \cup D_5$ and $X_{1-s,s}$ closely related to $D_3 \cup D_4$, we know that $X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}$ is the suitable function space for the region D_2 in view of Lemma 2.7.

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries. In Section 3, we establish some important bilinear estimates. In Section 4, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we give some preliminaries which are crucial in establishing Lemmas 3.1-3.5 and Theorems 1.1,1.2.

Lemma 2.1. *Let u_l with $l = 1, 2$ be $L^2([0, 2\pi) \times \mathbf{R})$-real valued functions. Then for any $(l_1, l_2) \in \mathbf{N}^2$,*

$$\|(\Psi_{l_1} u_1) * (\Psi_{l_2} u_2)\|_{L^2_{k\tau}} \leq C \left(2^{l_1} \wedge 2^{l_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(2^{l_1} \vee 2^{l_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\Psi_{l_1} u_1\|_{L^2} \|\Psi_{l_2} u_2\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.1}$$

For the proof of Lemma 2.1, we refer the readers to Lemma A.1 of [68, 74].

Lemma 2.2. *Let $u(x,t), v(x,t)$ be 2π-periodic functions and $a+b \geq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\min\{a, b\} > \frac{1}{6}$. Then, we have that*

$$\|uv\|_{L^2_{xt}} \leq C \|u\|_{X_{0,a}([0,2\pi)\times\mathbf{R})} \|v\|_{X_{0,b}([0,2\pi)\times\mathbf{R})}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\|uv\|_{X_{0,-a}} \leq C \|u\|_{X_{0,b}([0,2\pi)\times\mathbf{R})} \|v\|_{L^2_{xt}}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|uv\|_{L^2_{xt}} &\leq C \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} \sum_{l_2 \geq 0} \|(\Psi_{l_1} u) * (\Psi_{l_2} v)\|_{L^2_{xt}} \\
&\leq C \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} \sum_{l_2 \geq 0} \left(2^{l_1} \wedge 2^{l_2}\right)^{1/2} \left(2^{l_1} \vee 2^{l_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \|\Psi_{l_1} u\|_{L^2} \|\Psi_{l_2} v\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $M_j = 2^{l_j}$ with $j = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $M_1 \geq M_2$ and $M_1 = N M_2$ and $u_{M_1} = \Psi_{l_1} u$ and $v_{M_2} = \Psi_{l_2} v$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|uv\|_{L^2_{xt}} &\leq C \sum_{M_1, M_2 \geq 1} M_1^{\frac{1}{6}} M_2^{1/2} \|u_{M_1}\|_{L^2} \|v_{M_2}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \sum_{N, M_2 \geq 1} M_2^{\frac{2}{3}} N^{\frac{1}{6}} \|u_{N M_2}\|_{L^2} \|v_{M_2}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \sum_{M_2, N \geq 1} N^{\frac{1}{6}-a} M_2^{\frac{2}{3}-a-b} (N M_2)^a \|u_{N M_2}\|_{L^2} M_2^b \|v_{M_2}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{X_{0,a}([0,2\pi)\times\mathbf{R})} \|v\|_{X_{0,b}([0,2\pi)\times\mathbf{R})}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can derive (2.3) by duality. □

We have completed the proof of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $u(x,t), v(x,t)$ be $2\pi\lambda$-periodic functions and $a+b \geq \frac{2}{3}$ and $\min\{a,b\} > \frac{1}{6}$. Then*

$$\|uv\|_{L^2_{xt}} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{0,a}(\mathbf{T}\times\mathbf{R})}\|v\|_{X_{0,b}(\mathbf{T}\times\mathbf{R})}, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\|uv\|_{X_{0,-a}} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{0,b}(\mathbf{T}\times\mathbf{R})}\|v\|_{L^2_{xt}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. By using a similar technique of Lemma 3.4 in [74] and Lemma 2.2, we obtain Lemma 2.3. □

We have completed the proof of Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Then, we have that*

$$\left\|\eta(t)\int_0^t S(t-\tau)F(\tau)d\tau\right\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|\Lambda^{-1}F\|_{Z^s}.$$

For the proof of Lemma 2.4, we refer the readers to [2].

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$. Then, we have that*

$$\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \leq C\|u\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}(D_1\bigcup D_2)} \leq C\|u\|_{Z^s(D_1\bigcup D_2)}. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. We firstly prove that (2.6). When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_1 \cup D_5$, since $\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{6}+2\epsilon$, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \geq \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_2$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that $\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{6}-3\epsilon} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{2s-1}$ which yields that $\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}$, thus, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \geq \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+2\epsilon}}$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_3 \cup D_4$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that $\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{6}-2\epsilon} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{2s-1}$ which yields that $\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+2\epsilon}$, thus, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \geq \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+2\epsilon}}$. Consequently, we have that $\|u\|_{Z^s} \geq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_2$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that $\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-s} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{1-2s}$ which yields that $\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon} \leq C\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}$, thus, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_3 \cup D_4$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that $\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon-s} \geq C\langle k\rangle^{1-2s}$ which yields that $\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s} \leq C\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}$, thus, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \geq C\|u\|_{X_{s,1-s}}$. Consequently, we have that $\|u\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}$. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality with respect to τ, we have that $\|\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u\|_{l^2_k l^1_\tau} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}$, consequently, we have that $\|u\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}$. Now we prove (2.7). When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_1$, since $\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \geq \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u \subset D_2$, since

$s \geq \epsilon + \frac{1}{6}$, we have that $\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{1/2} \leq C\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}$, consequently, we have that $\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \geq \|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}$. □

We have completed the proof of Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that $s \in \mathbf{R}$. Then, we have that*

$$\|\eta(t)S(t)\phi\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.5, we have that $X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Z^s \hookrightarrow C([0,T] : H^s(\mathbf{T}))$. □

We have completed the proof of Lemma 2.6.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\tau = \tau_1 + \tau_2, k = k_1 + k_2$, $\sigma = \tau - k^3, \sigma_1 = \tau_1 - k_1^3, \sigma_2 = \tau_1 - k_2^3$. Then, we have that*

$$3\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\} \geq |\sigma - \sigma_1 - \sigma_2| = \left|k^3 - k_1^3 - k_2^3\right| = 3|kk_1k_2|.$$

Moreover, one of the following three cases must occurs:

$$(a) : |\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\} \geq |kk_1k_2|,$$
$$(b) : |\sigma_1| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\} \geq |kk_1k_2|,$$
$$(c) : |\sigma_2| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\} \geq |kk_1k_2|.$$

Since the proof is easy and we omit it here.

3. Bilinear estimates

In this section, we establish Lemmas 3.1-3.5.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, where $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{10^9}$. Then, we have*

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}, \tag{3.1}$$

here $C > 0$, which is independent of λ, $\|\cdot\|_{X^s}$ is the norm removing $\|\cdot\|_{Y^s}$ from $\|\cdot\|_{Z^s}$.

Proof. Obviously, $\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\subset\bigcup_{j=1}^{8}\Omega_j$, where

$$\Omega_1=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2:\max\{|k_1|,|k|\}\le 1\right\},$$
$$\Omega_2=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k_1|\sim|k_2|\gg|k|\ge 1\right\},$$
$$\Omega_3=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k_1|\sim|k_2|\gg|k|,1\ge|k|\ge\frac{1}{\lambda}\right\},$$
$$\Omega_4=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k|\sim|k_2|\gg|k_1|\ge 1\right\},$$
$$\Omega_5=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k|\sim|k_2|\gg|k_1|,1\ge|k_1|\ge\frac{1}{\lambda}\right\},$$
$$\Omega_6=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k|\sim|k_1|\gg|k_2|\ge 1\right\},$$
$$\Omega_7=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k|\sim|k_1|\gg|k_2|,1\ge|k_2|\ge\frac{1}{\lambda}\right\},$$
$$\Omega_8=\left\{(\tau_1,k_1,\tau,k)\in\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2\cap\Omega_1^c:|k|\sim|k_1|\sim|k_2|\ge 1\right\}.$$

(1) In region Ω_1. By using (2.6), since $\max\{|k_1|,|k|\}\le 1$, by using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the Young inequality as well as Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s}\le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\||k|\|_{l_k^2}\|\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2}\le C\|\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) In region Ω_2. In this region, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

(a) Case $|\sigma|=\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$. In this case, we have that $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2]\subset D_3$. When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_j\subset D_1\cup D_2$ with $j=1,2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le s\le\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s}\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|(J^su_1)(J^su_2)\|_{L_{xt}^2}\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.7, the Young inequality and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_1 * \langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[\langle k\rangle^{2s}\mathscr{F}u_1\right] * \mathscr{F}u_2\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_1\right] * \left[\langle k\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|\langle k\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^1L_\tau^1} \le C\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|\langle k\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, this case can be proved similarly to $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$.

(b) Case $|\sigma_1| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we consider the following cases:

$$(i): |\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}, (ii): |\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\},$$

respectively.

When (i) occurs: if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1$ which yields that $1 \le |k| \le C$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^{2\epsilon+\frac{1}{3}-s}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^s\Lambda^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^{1-s}\Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (ii) occurs: we have $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

Case $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ can be proved similarly to $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, we consider $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_1$, $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_2$, $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_3$, respectively.

When $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_1$ which yields that $1 \leq |k| \leq C$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s-1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} (\langle k \rangle \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle \mathscr{F} u_2) \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| (\langle k \rangle^{s} \langle \sigma \rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_2) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \\
&\leq C \left\| \left(J^{s} \Lambda^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon} u_1 \right) \left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} u_2 \right) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \\
&\leq C \|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_2$, by using the Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s-1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[(\langle k \rangle \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| \left(J^{1-s} \Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon} u_1 \right) \left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} u_2 \right) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \\
&\leq C \|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon,\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\leq C \|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.5, the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality as well as Lemmas 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s-1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \langle \sigma \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \left(\langle k \rangle^{2} \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle \mathscr{F} u_2 \right) \right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty} \\
&\leq C \left\| \left(\langle k \rangle^{s+\frac{5}{2}+\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_1 \right) * \mathscr{F} u_2 \right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{-3s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \right\|_{l_k^\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Case $|\sigma_2| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$. This case can be proved similarly to case (b).

(3) Region Ω_3. We consider $|k| \le |k_1|^{-2}$ and $|k_1|^{-2} < |k| \le 1$, respectively.

When $|k| \le |k_1|^{-2}$, by using the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality as well as Lemma 2.5, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \le C \left\| \langle k\rangle^{s-2}|k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| [\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,0}}\|u_2\|_{Y^0} \\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the case $|k_1|^{-2} < |k| \le 1$. In this case, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_4$, by using Lemma 2.7 and the Young inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \le C \left\| |k|\langle k\rangle^{-s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| [(|k|^s\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|^s\mathscr{F}u_2)] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| [(|k|^s\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|^s\mathscr{F}u_2)] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,0}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (b) occurs: we consider $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, respectively.

When $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, we have that $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1$, by using the Lemma 2.5, Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $|k| \le 1$ and $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \\
&\le C \left\| |k|\langle k\rangle^{s-2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| |k|^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\left[(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| \left[(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, we have $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

Case $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$.

Case $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, we consider $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_1$ and $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_2$ and $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_3$, respectively.

When $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_1$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \le C \left\| |k| \langle k \rangle^{s-2} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| \left(J^s \Lambda^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon} u_1 \right) \left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} u_2 \right) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \\
&\le C \|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C \|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_2$ and $\operatorname{supp} [\mathscr{F} u_1 * \mathscr{F} u_2] \subset D_4$, by using the Hölder inequality, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} \partial_x (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \le C \left\| |k| \langle k \rangle^{-s-1} \langle \sigma \rangle^{s-1} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| |k| \langle k \rangle^{-s-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\le C \| \langle k \rangle^{-2s-\frac{4}{3}+4\epsilon} \|_{l_k^\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \\
&\le C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

case $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} u_1 \subset D_2$ and $\operatorname{supp} [\mathscr{F} u_1 * \mathscr{F} u_2] \subset D_5$, by using the Hölder inequality, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1} (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \partial_x \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \le C \left\| |k| \langle k \rangle^{s-2} \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\le C \left\| |k| \langle k \rangle^{s-\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} \langle \sigma \rangle^{\frac{1}{3}} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F} u_1) * (|k| \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\le C \left\| |k|^{\frac{2}{3}-s+\epsilon} \left[(\langle k \rangle^{1-s} \Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\le C \left\| \left[(\langle k \rangle^{1-s} \Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_1) * (\langle k \rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon} \mathscr{F} u_2) \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\le C \|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \|u_2\|_{X_{s,0}} \\
&\le C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$ and $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_4$, by using the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{-1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{-s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{-2s-2+4\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-4s}\left[(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\Lambda^s\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\Lambda^s\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\|\langle k\rangle^{-4s}\|_{l_k^\infty}\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

case $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$ and $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_5$, by the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{s-2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{s-\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-4s}\left[(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\Lambda^s\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\Lambda^s\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\|\langle k\rangle^{-4s}\|_{l_k^\infty}\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case (c) can be proved similarly to case (b).

(4) Region Ω_4. In this case, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: if $|\sigma| > 4\max\{|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we have $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_2$. In this case, by using Lemmas 2.3, 2.7, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{2}{3}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|(J^su_1)(J^su_2)\|_{L_{xt}^2} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma| \le 4\max\{|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we have that $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_1|$ or $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_1|$, if $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_1$, then, $1 \le |k_1| \le C$, by using Lemma 2.3,

since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le \|(J^s u_1)(J^s u_2)\|_{L^2_{xt}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};$$

if $\mathrm{supp}\,[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_2$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x(\prod_{j=1}^{2}u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{2}{3}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le \|(J^s u_1)(J^s u_2)\|_{L^2_{xt}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};$$

if $\mathrm{supp}\,[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le \left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s-1}u_2)\right\|_{L^2_{xt}}$$
$$\le C\left\|(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{-1-s}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|\langle k\rangle^{-1-s}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^1L_\tau^1} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.$$

When $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_2|$, if $\mathrm{supp}\,[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_1$, then $1 \le |k_1| \le C$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le \|(J^s u_1)(J^s u_2)\|_{L^2_{xt}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};$$

if $\mathrm{supp}\,[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_2$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x(\prod_{j=1}^{2}u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{2}{3}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}$$
$$\le \left\|(J^s u_1)(J^{1-s}\Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};$$

if supp $[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.3 and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq \left\|(J^{-2}u_1)(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_2)\right\|_{L_{xt}^2}\\
&\leq C\|J^{-2}u_1\|_{l_k^1L_\tau^1}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \leq C\|u_1\|_{Y^s}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b): $|\sigma_1| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$. We consider $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, respectively.

When $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, then supp $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, if supp $[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_1$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s}u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if supp $[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_2$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{2}{3}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s}u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if supp $[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.3 and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-2}u_2)\right\|_{L_{xt}^2}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|\langle k\rangle^{-2}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^1L_\tau^1}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$ we have $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

Case $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, we have $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$.

When $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_1$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, by using Lemma 2.7, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon+s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-s-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\right\|_{l_k^\infty}\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_2$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le -\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, by using Lemma 2.7, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{2}{3}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{\frac{3}{2}-s+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{6}}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-s-\frac{4}{3}-2\epsilon}\right\|_{l_k^\infty}\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$ and $\operatorname{supp}[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2] \subset D_3$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{\frac{3}{2}-s+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{2s+4\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-2s-2+7\epsilon}\right\|_{l_k^\infty}\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When case (c) occurs: we have that $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2 \cup D_3$.

If $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$, we consider $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, respectively.

When $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.6, 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(\mathscr{F}u_1)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, by using Lemmas 2.6, 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\left(\langle k\rangle^{2s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-s-\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, we consider $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, respectively.

When $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.6, 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(\mathscr{F}u_1)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$ and $\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, by using Lemmas 2.6, 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$,

we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\left(\langle k\rangle^{2s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-s}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(5) In region Ω_5. In this region, we consider $|k_1|\le|k|^{-2}$ and $|k|^{-2}<|k_1|\le 1$, respectively. When $|k_1|\le|k|^{-2}$, by using the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality as well as Lemma 2.5, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le s\le-\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-2}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[\mathscr{F}u_1*(\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^2l_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|k|^{-2}<|k_1|\le 1$. In this region, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively. When (a) occurs: by using Lemma 2.5, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le s\le\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[(|k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{3}-2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^1l_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\|\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (b) occurs: by using Lemma 2.5, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz

inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+2\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[(|k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{s-\frac{1}{3}-2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^1l_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (c) occurs: by using Lemma 2.5, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[(|k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^1l_\tau^1}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{Y^s}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(6)In region Ω_6. This region can be proved similarly to Ω_4.

(7)In region Ω_7. This region can be proved similarly to Ω_5.

(8)In region Ω_8. In this region, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: if $|\sigma| > 4\max\{|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1\cup D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\operatorname{supp}(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2)\subset D_3$ and $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{2-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|(J^su_1)(J^su_2)\right\|_{L_{xt}^2} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,1/2}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $|\sigma| > 4\max\{|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{1+s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le \left\|\left[J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1\right]\left[J^{-s}u_2\right]\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \le \|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $|\sigma| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$, we have $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_1|$ or $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_1|$. In this case, $\operatorname{supp}(\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2) \subset D_3$, then by using the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k\rangle^{2-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s-1}\left(\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right) \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| (\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_1) * \left[\langle k\rangle^{-2}\mathscr{F}u_2\right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \|\langle k\rangle^{-2}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^1 L_\tau^1} \\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \|\langle k\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_2|$, this case can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| \sim |\sigma_1|$.

When (b) occurs: we consider case $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, respectively.

When $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$ which yields $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, we consider $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_1$, $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, respectively.

If $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_1$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2) \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| (J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s}u_2) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2) \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| (J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s}u_2) \right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \\
&\leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(\langle k\rangle^{s+\frac{5}{2}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \mathscr{F}u_2\right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-3s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\right\|_{l_k^\infty}\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we have that $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$, this case can be proved similarly to $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

If $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_j \subset D_3$ with $j=1,2$, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(\langle k\rangle^{s+\frac{5}{2}+\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \mathscr{F}u_2\right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-3s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\right\|_{l_k^\infty}\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

$(c): |\sigma_2| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$ can be proved similarly to $|\sigma_1| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

We have completed the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Remark 3. In the process of proving Lemma 3.1, the cases Ω_3 is the most difficult to deal with and cases Ω_j with $j=2,3$ require restriction $s > \frac{1}{6}$, more precisely, case (b) of region Ω_2 determines that $s \ge \frac{1}{6}+\epsilon$ is necessary.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, $0<\epsilon\ll 1$. Then, we have that*

$$\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Obviously, $\left(\mathbf{R}\times\dot{Z}_\lambda\right)^2 \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{8}\Omega_j$, where $\Omega_j (1\le j\le 8)$ are defined as Lemma 3.1.

(1) In region Ω_1. By using Lemma 2.5 and the Hölder inequality as well as the Cauchy-

Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left(\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\||k|\|_{l_k^2}\left\|\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|\mathscr{F}u_2\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) In region Ω_2. We consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

(a) Case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$, by using Lemma 2.7, the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le \left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|(\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^1}\\
&\le \left\|(\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^1} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Case $|\sigma_1| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$, in this case, we consider the following cases:

$$(i): |\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}, \quad (ii): |\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\},$$

respectively.

When (i) occurs: if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1$ which yields that $1 \le |k| \le C$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\le C\left\|\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1) * (|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1) * (\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^s\Lambda^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\le C\left\|\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le \left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^{1-s}\Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\|u\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (ii) occurs: we have $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ is valid, this case can be proved similarly to $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1$ which yields that $1 \le |k| \le C$, by using Lemma 2.5, 2.7, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\le C\left\|\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le \left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^{s}\Lambda^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp} u_1 \subset D_2$, we can assume that $\operatorname{supp} u_2 \subset D_2$, we can assume that $|\sigma| \le C|k_1|^3$, by using the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have

that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\le C\left\|\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le \left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(J^{1-s}\Lambda^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}u_1\right)\left(J^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Case $|\sigma_2| = \{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$. This case can be proved similarly to case (b).

(3) Region Ω_3. We consider $|k| \le |k_1|^{-2}$ and $|k_1|^{-2} < |k| \le 1$, respectively.

When $|k| \le |k_1|^{-2}$, by using Lemma 2.5 and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,0}}\|u_2\|_{Y^0} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|k_1|^{-2} < |k| \le 1$, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: by using the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2]\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|\mathscr{F}u_j\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (b) occurs: we consider $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, respectively.

When $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, in this case, $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_1$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$ and

the Hölder inequality and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\left(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we have that $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma|$, this case can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma|=\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma_2|$, if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_j\subset D_1$ with $j=1,2$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\hookrightarrow Y^s$ and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le s\le\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\||k|^{\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}\left(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_j\subset D_2$ with $j=1,2$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\hookrightarrow Y^s$, Lemmas 2.7, 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le s\le\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\||k|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_1\right)*\left(\langle k\rangle^{-s+\frac{1}{3}+2\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{X^{0,-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_j\subset D_3$ with $j=1,2$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\hookrightarrow Y^s$ and Lemma 2.5, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon\le$

$s \le \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\le C\left\| |k|\langle k\rangle^{s-2}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \left(|k|\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\| \left(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \left(\langle k\rangle^{-2s+1}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\left\|u_1\right\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\left\|u_2\right\|_{X_{1-2s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\left\|u_j\right\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\left\|u_j\right\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When case (c) occurs: this case can be proved similarly to case (b).

(4) Region Ω_4. In this case, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1}\left[\left(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \left(\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-2}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1 * \left(\langle k\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|\left[\left(\langle k\rangle^{-2}\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \left(\langle k\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\|\langle k\rangle^{-2}u_1\|_{l_k^1 L_\tau^1}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b): $|\sigma_1| = \max\left\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\right\}$.

We consider $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\left\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\right\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \le 4\max\left\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\right\}$, respectively.

If $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\left\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\right\}$, then $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$, by using Lemma 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Z^s} \le C\left\| \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[\left(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1\right) * \left(\langle k\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^{s}u_1)(J^{-s}u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{2}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_1| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_2|\}$, we have that $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$, this case can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|, |\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, we have $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$ and $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2 \bigcup D_3$.

When $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$, by using Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Y^s} \\
&\leq C \left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Z^s} \leq C \left\| \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^s \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F}u_1) * \mathscr{F}u_2 \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left(\langle k \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}+3\epsilon} \mathscr{F}u_1 \right) * \left(\langle k \rangle^s \langle \sigma \rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon} \mathscr{F}u_2 \right) \right\|_{l_k^2 l_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$, since $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Y^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^s \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \left[|k| \mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2 \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2} \\
&\leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{s+\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \langle \sigma \rangle^{2\epsilon} \left[(|k| \mathscr{F}u_1) * \mathscr{F}u_2 \right] \right\|_{l_k^\infty L_\tau^\infty} \\
&\leq C \left\| \left(\langle k \rangle^{s+\frac{3}{2}+7\epsilon} \mathscr{F}u_1 \right) * \mathscr{F}u_2 \right\|_{l_k^\infty l_\tau^\infty} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^{-3s-\frac{1}{2}+7\epsilon} \right\|_{l_k^\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \\
&\leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{X_{1-s,s}} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When case (c) occurs: by using Lemma 2.5, we have that

$$\left\| \Lambda^{-1}(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Y^s} \leq C \left\| \langle k \rangle^s \langle \sigma \rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon} \left[|k| \mathscr{F}u_1 * \mathscr{F}u_2 \right] \right\|_{l_k^2 L_\tau^2}.$$

By using a proof similar to case (c) of region Ω_4 of Lemma 3.1, we can obtain that

$$\left\| (1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\partial_x \prod_{j=1}^{2} (\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Y^s} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{2} \|u_j\|_{Z^s}.$$

(5) In region Ω_5. In this region, we consider the case $|k_1| \leq |k|^{-2}$ and $|k|^{-2} \leq |k_1| \leq 1$, respectively.

When $|k_1| \leq |k|^{-2}$, by using Lemma 2.5, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-2}\left[\mathscr{F}u_1*\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^1l_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \leq C\|\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|k|^{-2} \leq |k_1| \leq 1$. In this case, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, respectively.

When (a) occurs: by using Lemma 2.7, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\leq C\left\|\left[\mathscr{F}u_1*(\langle k\rangle^{s-1}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\leq C\left\|\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^1l_\tau^1}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \leq C\|\mathscr{F}u_1\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (b) occurs, in this case $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_4$. In this case, we consider case $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$ and $|\sigma_1| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$, respectively.

When consider case $|\sigma_1| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$, by using the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \leq C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[|k|\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{6}-\epsilon}\left[(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{-2s}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\\
&\leq C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,1/2}} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_1| \leq 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_2|\}$, we have $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$.

Case $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma|$ can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_1| \sim |\sigma_2|$, we consider case $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_1$, $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, respectively.

When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_1$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_2$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s+\frac{1}{3}-\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_2 \subset D_3$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$, the Young inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^{1-s}\langle\sigma\rangle^{s}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{0,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (c) occurs: we consider case $|\sigma_2| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|\}$ and $|\sigma_2| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|\}$, respectively.

When consider case $|\sigma_2| > 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|\}$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$, the Young inequality

and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(|k|\mathscr{F}u_1)*\mathscr{F}u_2\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle\sigma\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}\left[(\langle k\rangle^{2\epsilon-\frac{5}{3}+s}\mathscr{F}u_1)*(\langle k\rangle^s\langle\sigma\rangle^{\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}\mathscr{F}u_2)\right]\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^2}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}}\\
&\le C\|u_1\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{5}{6}-\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\sigma_2| \le 4\max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|\}$, we have $|\sigma_2|\sim|\sigma|$ or $|\sigma_2|\sim|\sigma_1|$.

Case $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma|$ can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma| = \max\{|\sigma|,|\sigma_1|,|\sigma_2|\}$.

When $|\sigma_2|\sim|\sigma_1|$, this case can be proved similarly to case $|\sigma_1|\sim|\sigma_2|$.

(6)In region Ω_6. This case can be proved similarly to Ω_4.

(7)In region Ω_7. This case can be proved similarly to Ω_7.

(8)In region Ω_8. In this case, we consider (a)-(c) of Lemma 2.7, respectively.

When (a) occurs: by using Lemma 2.7 and the Young inequality, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s} \le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s+1}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1}\left(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2\right)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^{s-2}(\mathscr{F}u_1*\mathscr{F}u_2)\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\\
&\le C\left\|\langle k\rangle^s\mathscr{F}u_1\right\|_{l_k^2L_\tau^1}\left\|\langle k\rangle^{-2}\mathscr{F}u_2\right\|_{l_k^1L_\tau^1} \le C\|u_1\|_{Y^s}\|u_2\|_{Y^s} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

When (b) occurs: if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_2$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$ and Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^s u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s};
\end{aligned}$$

if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}u_1 \subset D_3$, by using $X_{s,\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \hookrightarrow Y^s$ and Lemmas 2.5, 2.3, since $\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon \le s \le \frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j)\right\|_{Y^s}\\
&\le C\left\|(J^{1-s}\Lambda^s u_1)(J^{-s} u_2)\right\|_{X_{0,-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}} \le C\|u_1\|_{X_{1-s,s}}\|u_2\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{6}+\epsilon}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case (c) can be proved similarly to Case (b).

We have completed the proof of Lemma 3.2.

Remark 4. In the process of proving Lemma 3.2, the cases Ω_3 is the most difficult to deal with and cases Ω_j with $j = 2, 3$ require restriction $s > \frac{1}{6}$, more precisely, case (b) of region Ω_2 determines that $s \geq \frac{1}{6} + \epsilon$ is necessary.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Then, we have that*

$$\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(\partial_x u_j) \right\|_{Z^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Combining the definition of Z^s with Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, we have Lemma 3.3.

We have completed the proof of Lemma 3.3.

By using a proof similar to Lemma 3.3, we have Lemmas 3.4, 3.5.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Then, we have that*

$$\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x\prod_{j=1}^{2}(u_j) \right\|_{Z^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}. \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\frac{1}{6} + \epsilon \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. Then, we have*

$$\left\| \Lambda^{-1}\partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{2}(u_j) \right\|_{Z^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{Z^s}. \tag{3.5}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Let $N \gg 1$, $a \in \dot{Z}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{F}u_1(k,\tau) &= \left(\chi_{(N)}(k) + \chi_{(N)}(-k)\right)\chi_{[-1,1]}(\tau - k^3),\\
\mathscr{F}u_2(k,\tau) &= \left(\chi_{(1-N)}(k) + \chi_{(1-N)}(-k)\right)\chi_{[-1,1]}(\tau - k^3),
\end{aligned}$$

here

$$\chi_a(k) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad k = a, \chi_a(k) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad k \neq a,$$

and

$$\chi_{[-1,1]}(\sigma) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad |\sigma| \leq 1, \chi_{[-1,1]} = 0, \quad \text{if} \quad |\sigma| > 1.$$

Then, we have that

$$\|u_j\|_{W^s} \sim N^s, j = 1, 2.$$

Let

$$R_1(k_1, k_2) = \chi_N(k_1)\chi_{(1-N)}(k_2), R_2(k_1, k_2) = \chi_N(k_1)\chi_{(1-N)}(-k_2),$$
$$R_3(k_1, k_2) = \chi_N(-k_1)\chi_{(1-N)}(k_2), R_4(k_1, k_2) = \chi_N(-k_1)\chi_{(1-N)}(-k_2).$$

Then, by using a direct computation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left[\langle\tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}F(u_1, u_2)\right]\right\|_{W^s}\\ &= \left\|\sum_{j=1}^{4}\int_{\dot{Z}}\frac{|k|^{s+1}}{1+k^2}\left[k^2 + 3 + k_1k_2\right]R_j(k_1, k_2)\left(\int_{\mathbf{R}}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1/2}\chi_{[-1,1]}(\sigma_1)\chi_{[-1,1]}(\sigma_2)d\sigma_1\right)dn_1\right\|_{L^2_{n\sigma}}.\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.7, we have that

$$\langle\sigma\rangle \sim |kk_1k_2|,$$

since $|\sigma_j| \leq 1$ with $j = 1, 2$. Thus, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}}\langle\sigma\rangle^{-1/2}\chi_{[-1,1]}(\sigma_1)\chi_{[-1,1]}(\sigma_2)d\sigma_1 \geq C|kk_1k_2|^{-1/2}.$$

By using a direct computation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left[\langle\tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}F(u_1, u_2)\right]\right\|_{W^s}\\ &\geq C\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{4}\int_{\dot{Z}}\frac{|k|^{s+1}}{1+k^2}\left[k^2 + 3 + k_1k_2\right]R_j(k_1, k_2)|kk_1k_2|^{-1/2}dk_1\right\|_{L^2_k} \geq CN.\end{aligned}$$

If (1.5) is invalid, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}CN &\leq \left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left[\langle\tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}F(u_1, u_2)\right]\right\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}\\ &\leq C\left\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}\left[\langle\tau - k^3\rangle^{-1}\mathscr{F}F(u_1, u_2)\right]\right\|_{W^s} \leq C\prod_{j=1}^{2}\|u_j\|_{W^s} \sim N^{2s}. \qquad (4.1)\end{aligned}$$

We obtain the contradiction since $s < \frac{1}{2}$. □

We have completed the proof of Theorem 1.1.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.2. Let

$$F(t) = \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(u^2) + \partial_x(1-\partial_x^2)^{-1}\left[u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2\right].$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi(u) = \eta(t)S(t)\phi - \eta(t)\int_0^t S(t-t^{'})F(t^{'})dt^{'},\\
&B = \left\{u \in Z^s : \quad \|u\|_{Z^s} \leq 2C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemmas 2.3-2.4 and Lemma 3.3-3.5, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi(u)\|_{Z^s} &\leq \|\eta(t)S(t)\phi\|_{Z^s} + \left\|\eta(t)\int_0^t S(t-t^{'})F(t^{'})dt^{'}\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\leq C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} + C\left\|\Lambda^{-1}F(t)\right\|_{Z^s}\\
&\leq C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} + C\|u\|_{Z^s}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, for sufficiently small $\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}$, we have that

$$\|\Phi(u)\|_{Z^s} \leq C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})} + 4C^3\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}^2 \leq 2C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}$$

on closed ball B. For $u, v \in B$, when $\|\phi\|_{H^s(0,2\pi)}$ is sufficiently small, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Phi(u) - \Phi(v)\|_{Z^s}\\
&\leq C\left(\|u\|_{Z^s} + \|v\|_{Z^s}\right)\|u-v\|_{Z^s} \leq 2C\|\phi\|_{H^s(\mathbf{T})}\|u-v\|_{Z^s} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u-v\|_{Z^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of the rest of Theorem 1.2 is standard, which can be found in [55, 75], thus, we omit the process.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China under grant numbers 11171116, 11471330 and 11401180. The first author is also supported in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China under the grant number 2012ZZ0072. The second author is supported by the NSF of China (No.11371367) and Fundamental research program of NUDT(JC12-02-03).

References

References

[1] R. Beals, D. Sattinger, J. Szmigielski, Multipeakons and a theorem of Stieltjes, *Inverse Problems* 15(1999), 1-4.

[2] I. Bejenaru, T. Tao, Sharp well-posedness and ill-posedness results for a quadratic non-linear Schrödinger equation, *J. Funct. Anal.* 233(2006), 228-259.

[3] J. Bourgain, Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations, part I: Schrödinger equations, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 3(1993), 107-156.

[4] J. Bourgain, Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations, part II: The KdV equation, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 3(1993), 209-262.

[5] J. Bourgain, Periodic Korteweg de vries equation with measures as initial data, *Sel. Math.* 3(1997), 115-159.

[6] J. Bourgain, Refinements of Strichartz' inequality and applications to 2 D-NLS with critical nonlinearity, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 5(1998), 253-283.

[7] A. Bressan, A. Constantin, Global conservative solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 183(2007), 215-239.

[8] A. Bressan, A. Constantin, Global dissipative solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation, *Anal. Appl.* 5(2007), 1-27.

[9] P. Byers, The Cauchy problem for a fifth order evolution equation, *Diff. Int. Eqns.* 16(2003), 537-556.

[10] P. Byers, The initial value problem for a KdV-type equation and a related bilinear estimate, dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2003.

[11] R. Camassa, D. Holm, An integrable shallow water equation with peaked solutions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 71(1993), 1661-1664.

[12] R. Camassa, D. Holm, J. Hyman, A new integrable shallow water equation, *Adv. Appl. Mech.* 31(1994), 1-33.

[13] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, T. Tao, Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV on $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{T}$, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16(2003), 705-749.

[14] A. Constantin, The Hamiltonian structure of the Camassa-Holm equation, *Exposition. Math.* 15(1997), 53-85.

[15] A. Constantin, Existence of permanent and breaking waves for a shallow water equation: a geometric approach, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 50(2000), 321-362.

[16] A. Constantin, On the blow-up of solutions of a periodic shallow water equation, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 10(2000), 391-399.

[17] A. Constantin, On the scattering problem for the Camassa-Holm equation, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A* 457(2001), 953-970.

[18] A. Constantin, The trajectories of particles in Stokes waves, *Invent. Math.* 166(2006), 523-535.

[19] A. Constantin, J. Escher, Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations, *Acta Math.* 181(1998), 229-243.

[20] A. Constantin, J. Escher, Well-posedness, global existence, and blowup phenomena for a periodic quasi-linear hyperbolic equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 51(1998), 475-504.

[21] A. Constantin, J. Escher, Global weak solutions for a shallow water equation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 47(1998), 1527-1545.

[22] A. Constantin, J. Escher, Global existence and blow-up for a shallow water equation, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* 26(1998), 303-328.

[23] A. Constantin, J. Escher, On the blow-up rate and the blow-up set of breaking waves for a shallow water equation, *Math. Z.* 233(2000), 75-91.

[24] A. Constantin, J. Escher, Particle trajectories in solitary water waves, *Bull. AMer. Math. Soc.* 44(2007), 423-431.

[25] A. Constantin, B. Kolev, J. Lenells, Integrability of invariant metrics on the Virasoro group, *Phys. Lett. A* 350(2006), 75-80.

[26] A. Constantin, B. Kolev, Geodesic flow on the diffeomorphism group of the circle, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 78(2003), 787-804.

[27] A. Constantin, D. Lannes, The hydrodynamical relevance of the Camssa-Holm and Degasperis-Procesi equation, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 192(2009), 165-186.

[28] A. Constantin, R. S. Johnson, Propagation of very long water waves, with vorticity, over variable depth, with applications to tsunamis, *Fluid Dynam. Res.*40 (2008), 175-211.

[29] A. Constantin, H. P. Mckean, A shallow water on the circle, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 52(1999), 949-982.

[30] A. Constantin, L. Molinet, Global weak solutions for a shallow water equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 211(2000), 45-61.

[31] A. Constantin, L. Molinet, Orbital stability of solitary waves for a shallow water equation, *Phys. D* 157(2001), 75-89.

[32] A. Constantin, W. Strauss, Stability of peakons, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 53(2000), 603-610.

[33] A. Constantin, W. A. Strauss, Stability of a class of solitary waves in compressible elastic rods, *Phys. Lett. A* 270(2000), 140-148.

[34] A. Constantin, W. A. Strauss, Stability of the Camassa-Holm solitons, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* 12(2002), 415-422.

[35] H. H. Dai, Model equations for nonlinear dispersive waves in a compressible Mooney-Rivlin rod, *Acta Mech.* 127(1998), 193-207.

[36] R. Danchin, A note on well-posedness for Camassa-Holm equation, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 192(2003), 429-444.

[37] H. R. Dullin, G. A. Gottwald, D. D. Holm, An integrable shallow water equation with linear and nonlinear dispersion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87(2001), 4501-4504 .

[38] J. Escher, Z. Y. Yin, Initial boundary value problems of the Camassa-Holm equation, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 33(2008), 377-395.

[39] J. Escher, Z. Y. Yin, Initial boundary value problems for nonlinear dispersive wave equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* 256(2009), 479-508.

[40] A. Fokas, B. Fuchssteiner, Symplectic structures, their *Bä*klund transformations and hereditary symmetries, *Phys. D.* 71(1981), 47-66.

[41] J. Gorsky, On the Cauchy problem for a KdV-type equation on the circle, dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2004.

[42] Z. H. Guo, Global well-posedness of Korteweg-de Vries equation in $H^{-3/4}(\mathbf{R})$, *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 91(2009), 583-597.

[43] A. A. Himonas, G. Misiolek, The Cauchy problem for a shallow water type equation, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.* 23(1998), 123-139.

[44] A. A. Himonas, G. Misiolek, Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for a shallow water equation on the circle, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 161(2000), 479-495.

[45] A. A. Himonas, G. Misiolek, The initial value problem for a fifth order shallow water in: Analysis, Geometry, Number Theory: The Mathematics of Leon Ehrenpreis, in: Contemp. Math. Vol. 251, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000, pp. 309-320.

[46] A. A. Himonas,G. Misiolek, G. Ponce, Y. Zhou, Persistence properties and unique continuation of solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 271(2007), 511-522.

[47] A. A. Himonas, G. Misiolek, High-frequency smooth solutions and well-posedness of the Camassa-Holm equation,*Int. Math. Res. Not.* 51(2005), 3135-3151.

[48] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in low-regularity spaces, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 20(2007), 753-798.

[49] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, D. Tataru, Global well-posedness of the KP-I initial-value problem in the energy space, *Invent. Math.* 173(2008), 265-304.

[50] R. I. Ivanov, Exended Camassa-Holm hierarchy and conserved quantities, *Z. Naturforsch* 61(2006), 133-138.

[51] R. I. Ivanov, Water waves and integrability, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A.* 365(2007), 2267-2280.

[52] R. S. Johnson, Camassa-Holm, Korteweg-de Vries and related models for water waves, *J. Fluid Mech.* 457(2002), 63-82.

[53] H. Kalisch, J. Lenells, Numerical study of traveling-wave solutions for the Camassa-Holm equation, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 25(2005), 287-298.

[54] T. Kappeler and P. Topalov, Global wellposedness of KdV in $H^{-1}(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{R})$, *Duke Math. J.* 135(2006), 327-360.

[55] T. K. Kato, Local well-posedness for Kawahara equation, Adv. Diff. Equ. 16(2011), 257-287.

[56] T. Kato, Low regularity well-posedness for the periodic Kawahara equation, *Diff. Int. Eqns.* 25(2012), 1011-1036.

[57] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 9(1996), 573-603.

[58] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, On the ill-posedness of some canonical dispersive equations, *Duke Math. J.* 106(2001), 617-633.

[59] N. Kishimoto, Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation at the critical regularity, *Diff. Int. Eqns.* 22(2009), 447-464.

[60] N. Kishimoto, K. Tsugawa, Local well-posedness for quadratic Schrödinger equation and "good" Boussinesq equation, *Diff. Int. Eqns.* 23(2010), 463-493.

[61] B. Kolev, Bi-Hamiltonian systems on the dual of the Lie algebra of vector fields of the circle and periodic shallow water equations, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A* 365(2007), 2333-2357.

[62] M. Lakshmanan, Integrable nonlinear wave equations and possible connections to tsunami dynamics, in: Tsunami and Nonlinear waves, Spinger, Berlin, 2007, 31-49.

[63] J. Lenells, The correspondence between KdV and Camassa-Holm, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 71(2004), 3797-3811.

[64] J. Lenells, Stability of periodic peakons, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 10(2004), 485-499.

[65] J. Lenells, Stability for the periodic Camassa-Holm equation, *Math. Scand.* 97(2005), 188-200.

[66] J. Lenells, Conservation laws of the Camassa-Holm equation, *J. Phys. A* 38(2005), 869-880.

[67] J. Lenells, Traveling wave solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation, *J. Differential Equations* 217(2005), 393-430.

[68] S. M. Li, W. Yan, Y. S. Li, J. H. Huang, The Cauchy problem for a higher order shallow water type equation on the circle, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 259(2015), 4863-4896.

[69] Y. S. Li, W. Yan, X. Y. Yang, Well-posedness of a higher order modified Camassa-Holm equation in spaces of low regularity, *J. Evol. Eqns.* 10(2010), 465-486.

[70] B. P. Liu, A priori bounds for KdV equation below $H^{-3/4}$, *J. Funct. Anal.,* 268(2015), 501-554.

[71] X. Liu, Y. Jin, The Cauchy problem of a shallow water equation, *Acta Math. Sin.(Engl. Ser.)* 30(2004), 1-16.

[72] Y. Li, P. Olver, Well-posedness and blow-up solutions for an integrable nonlinearly dispersive model wave equation, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 162(2000), 27-63.

[73] Y. S. Li, X. Y. Yang, Global well-posedness for a fifth-order shallow water equation on the circle, *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B Engl. Ed.* 31(2011), 1303-1317.

[74] L. Molinet, Sharp ill-posedness results for the KdV and mKdV equations on the torus, Advances in Mathematics, 230(2012), 1895-1930.

[75] T. Muramatu, S. Taoka, The initial data value problem for the 1-D semilinear Schrödinger equation in the Besov space, *J. Math. Soc. Japan.* 56(2004), 853-888.

[76] K. Nakanishi, H. Takaoka, Y. Tsutsumi, Local well-posedness in low regularity of the mKdV equation with periodic boundary condition, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 28(2010), 1635-1654.

[77] E. A. Olson, Well posedness for a higher order modified Camassa-Holm equation, *J. Diff. Eqns.*, 246(2009), 4154-4172.

[78] G. Rodriguez-Blanco, On the Cauchy problem for the Camassa-Holm equation, *Nonlinear Anal.* 46(2001), 309-327.

[79] H. Takoaoka, Y. Tsutsumi, Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the modified KdV equation with periodic boundary condition, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*56(2004), 3009-3040.

[80] T. Tao, Multilinear weighted convolution of L^2 functions, and applicationsto nonlinear dispersive equations, *Amer. J. Math.* 123(2001), 839-908.

[81] J. F. Toland, Stokes waves, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.* 7(1996), 1-48.

[82] H. Wang, S. B. Cui, Global well-posedness of the Cauchy problem of the fifth order shallow water equation, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 230(2006), 600-613.

[83] Z. P. Xin, P. Zhang, On the weak solutions to a shallow water equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 53(2000), 1411-1433.

[84] Z. P. Xin, P. Zhang, On the uniqueness and large time behavior of the weak solutions to a shallow water equation. *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.* 27(2002), 1815-1844.

[85] X. Y. Yang, Y. S. Li, Global well-posedness for a fifth-order shallow water equation in Sobolev spaces, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 248(2010), 1458-1472.

[86] Z. Yin, Well-posedness, global existence and blowup phenomena for an integrable shallow water equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. A* 10(2004), 393-411.